

Off to a Slow Start

8 October 53.

Each Justice and State Worker Faces Full Probe

By ANTHONY LEWIS

Every full-time employee of the Justice and State departments—from the \$1810-a-year maintenance worker on up—faces a full field investigation by the FBI and other probers under the new security program for Federal workers.

But at other civilian departments the chances that an employee will have to undergo a full-scale security investigation are as low as 1 in 10.

That is the sharpest contrast in the still developing picture of the Eisenhower Administration's security set-up, under which each Federal department and agency makes its own standards and operates its own security clearance system.

The executive order which junked the old Truman loyalty-security standards and established the new set-up was issued last April. The Justice Department at the same time issued sample regulations to guide each agency in drafting its security rules.

ALL BUT ONE

Since then department lawyers, security officers and assorted high officials have been trying to shape the Justice sample to each agency's particular needs. All the Cabinet departments but one—Interior—have now published security regulations.

In most cases the department rules closely follow the Justice sample on security standards, procedures for evaluation of each case and employee rights of appeal. The big difference among the departments is in the extent of investigating.

Justice and State have several reasons for requiring full field investigations of all employees.

Both departments handle a large amount of security material, often dealing with communist problems. While some employees—janitors, for example—would not ordinarily handle such material, security officers think it's safer to be sure about everyone.

COMMON SENSE

Then again State and Justice have born the brunt of Congressional attacks during the last few years on disloyalty and dishonesty charges.

Security officers at other agencies told The News they would prefer requiring full investigations for all their employees, but expense and common sense ruled that out.

Some Cabinet departments other than State and Justice have ordered full field investigations for employees who have access to information rated Confidential, Secret or Top Secret in the classification scale.

Others, narrowing it even more, require the full inquiries only for those with access to Secret or Top Secret material—less than 10 per cent of department personnel.

In all agencies employees who have had full field investigations in the past must be re-evaluated under the new standards and possibly re-investigated.

In any case, the Eisenhower executive order requires that every agency make at least a routine check of schools, churches and previous employers before hiring anyone.

SLOW START

Because of the widely distributed authority on security matters, it is difficult to get any overall picture of how the Eisenhower program is operating—except the elaborate procedure for setting standards and appeals has been slow starting.

The Civil Service Commission has the job, under the executive order, of looking into all the agencies' security programs and reporting to the National Security Council on their effectiveness and fairness.

CSC hasn't completed a first round of investigations and its findings are not even a central source of statistics.

To guide Federal agencies in drafting their own security rules, the Justice Department last spring published a set of sample departmental regulations.

The sample provided that every U. S. citizen permanently employed in the agency be given a copy of any charges against him, be permitted to answer and be given a hearing before a three-man board drawn from a central Civil Service Commission panel. At the hearing the accused employee was to have legal rights, including the privilege of calling witnesses.

Justice further set out these seven kinds of acts which should be counted against employees in security checks:

- (1) Lying, criminal acts, alcoholism, drug addiction, sexual perversion, insanity or susceptibility to coercion.
- (2) Sabotage or espionage.
- (3) Friendly association with a spy or traitor.
- (4) Advocating overthrow of the Government by force.
- (5) Membership or association in a subversive group.
- (6) Violation of security regulations.
- (7) Acting in the interests of a foreign country instead of the U. S.

Statistics on the number of Federal employees dismissed or cleared—figures which the Loyalty Review Board put out in Truman days.

But these are the broad differences in the actual security regulations published so far:

Defense

Its regulations are the only ones to change the criteria set out in the Justice Department sample. To the basic seven, Defense adds these 10:

- Participation in a front outfit when the accused employee knew it was subversive or was being infiltrated by subversives, or when the accused employee "should reasonably have the knowledge." (Ignorance is no excuse.)
 - "Sympathetic interest in totalitarian, fascist, communist" or similar movements.
 - Current association with a person who would be barred from Defense employment under these rules, or past association "if the circumstances indicate that renewal of the association is probable."
 - "Acts of a reckless . . . nature which indicate . . . the individual might . . . assist . . . deliberately or inadvertently in activities inimical to the security of the United States."
 - Presence of a relative in an unfriendly country where he might be used to bring pressure on the employee.
- A Defense Department spokesman said these criteria were added because "the more specific the standards, the easier it is for security officers to do their job."

FLEXIBLE

But the Defense regulations themselves insist on some flexibility. They say the various misdeeds listed are "of varying degrees of seriousness," so security men must use "over-all common sense."

The new regulations also specifically reassure civilian employees at Defense that "national security" will not be used as an excuse for firing people without "normal Civil Service procedures."

Defense requires full field investigations down to the "Confidential" in a majority of full-time workers here. Defense will not draw on the cen-

tral Civil Service panel for appeal hearing boards. Instead it will use its own men—but with the rule that an employee of one service must be heard by men from another, for example an accused Army worker by a Navy man.

State

In addition to demanding full inquiries of every employee, State's rules add this somewhat stern warning:

"A former course of conduct or holding of beliefs shall be presumed to continue in the absence of clear and convincing evidence to the contrary."

Justice

The regulations exempt the FBI, which will continue its own security system. They let the Deputy Attorney General decide which employees must have full investigations, but a spokesman said in practice all would. Justice's rules show some minor changes from its own sample drafted last spring, including this paragraph:

"If during the course of a hearing . . . an employee, or his counsel, or any of his witnesses, is guilty of misbehavior or contemptuous conduct . . . , the (hearing) board is authorized to exclude said employee . . ."

Treasury

Full investigations down to "Secret" level only. Provisions follow the Justice sample closely, but add this paragraph:

"Any clearance granted . . . will be rescinded should information subsequently be received which indicates that the retention of the employee is no longer clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

Post Office,

Commerce, Labor

Full investigations thru "Confidential" level. No significant changes from Justice sample.

Health-Education-Welfare

Follows Justice sample closely, full field inquiries to "Secret" level only.

Agriculture

Full investigations only to "Secret" level. Agriculture, with its vast network of part-time agents, also exempts from all investigations temporary workers, foreigners employed in their own countries, unpaid agents and persons working on the hoof-and-mouth disease control program in Mexico.

Atomic Energy Commission

The AEC has always had its own security set-up, dictated by law, and it is staying aloof from the new program except possibly for some "minor changes" in wording of rules.

Central Intelligence

Agency

The other super-secret post-war outfit took the opposite tack and drafted new rules which follow the Justice sample closely, with these two major exceptions:

- CIA will have to clear by its own security system any hearing board member drawn from the Civil Service panel to hear a CIA case.
- CIA Director Allen Dulles and his deputy reserve the right to fire an employee summarily if they think a "dangerous national security" employee gave assurance this loophole would be used rarely, if at all.